Response to LJCAA Letter Submitted to CACC November 11, 2016
Regarding Statewide Limited Jurisdiction Case Management System (AJACS) Concerns

Issue Number	Issue Description	Issue Respose
1	Lack of or limited training, training documentation, and/or AJACS user guide	Apache Junction MC did not receive formal classroom training. Training for this court was side by side one-on-one training over the course of 6 weeks. All Pima County Courts received two one week formal face to face training sessions followed by one to two weeks of onsite implementation support.

Following Apache Junction MC implementation numerous AJACS functionality documents were created - both detailed and quick reference guides. Documentation continues to be created and modified, as necessary.
Existing documentation is located at:
http://ajinweb/ajacscms/ProjectDocs_lj.htm

Each class completed to date has been given class surveys to determine the effectiveness of the training sessions and most are within the "Good" to "Excellent" range. Copies of these surveys can be made available. |
2	Delayed response from AOC with regards to AJACS changes or issues once the product is rolled out	Difficult to provide measurement of this issue. LJ Team staff was onsite with Apache Junction MC for approximately 6 weeks. Once back at AOC AJMC staff was calling, emailing, im'ing on a daily basis, numerous times a day. All issues were worked as quickly as possible with AJ staff on line or Lync/Skype. AJ was asked to start routing calls to AOC Support Center and there was an initial delay in response time as Remedy support processes were worked out. All Pima County courts have also had direct contact with LJ Team since day one go live until December 7, at which time they were asked to begin calling AOC Support Center to enter issues in to Remedy for tracking and triaging purposes. AJ has experienced two system upgrades and Pima County has experienced one system upgrade since going live. All upgrades were communicated prior to deployment and instructions on how to process upgrade were included in communication along with product improvement release notes.
3	Court concerns communicated via email are not responded to for days or weeks or not at all	See above
4	Entering cases into AJACS that fallout at conversion	This is an issue that AOC failed to provide solution for prior to court implementation. This has been rectified and is included in the next release being pushed to production (December 18).

5	ROA not opening for some cases (showing exception errors)	This issue is being caused by court clerks entering comments in to two differnet comment/notes fields within different modules of the case. This has been identified as being a bug which has been rectified and is included in the next release being pushed to production (December 18). A database script has been developed and has been run on each court database to fix the impacted cases.
6	Tickler dates either showing as satisfied when they are not or not showing satisfied when they should	LJ Team has been tasked with further testing and troubleshooting of this issue. In test environment we have been unable to duplicate. Will need further information from person reporting this issue.
7	Small bugs in the Case Worksheet; mainly on the fine/fee assessments	Presumptive fines/fees for Civil Traffic cases were pre-configured within AJACS for each court go live but Criminal presumptive fines/fees were not. Courts need to enter this information at sentencing/adjudication. Some financial configuration has had to be modified in production databases and has been accomplished in as quick and effiecient manner as possible.
8	Rule 3.1c, ARCrP warrant option not available	Correct that this warrant option is not available in the drop down menus for selection. All warrants will be replaced by one new warrant effective January 1, 2016. This is included in the next release being pushed to production (December 18).
9	Case status errors; some cases remain open when they should be closed	Cases in AJACS should close automatically once all outstanding monies and obligations have been paid and satisfied. For converted cases there is a process that has now been documented that will need to be followed to trigger a evaluation of the case to determine case closure eligibility.
10	Duplicate cases appearing in the search screen	Using the Search functionality the user has the ability to perform a broad search or to qualify search criteria to perform a more granular search. AJACS returns results on a basic case search for each party on the case. This may be why issue is reported that duplciate cases are appearing. The case is not duplicated - all parties are being displayed. To eliminate multiple case results the user can choose to select Party Role Type of Defendant and only one result will be displayed.
11	Not being able to scan documents into converted cases	Scanning documents into AJACS is available and working. There is no difference between scanning documents into new or converted cases. AOC OnBase Administrator had an issue with the size of the files being transmitted to OnBase by one Pima County Court so process was stopped until it could be further tested. Initial training with court did not result in large file generation. Further testing is underway.
12	Isssues with warrants on converted cases	Warrants were not converted from AZTEC to AJACS, which has been explained to all courts and is further discussed during pre-implementation meetings. There is a process that will need to be followed to add the Warrant back in to the converted cases but the process works when followed properly.

13	No statistics or reports which affect the ability to report on case processing standards	Statistical Reports within LJ AJACS are still being developed. Business Requirements have not been fully created by CSD business team so that reports can be developed within AJACS.
14	Issues with Security Settings; initially everyone could do everythig (including deleting a cases) and then most staff can't view a juvenile case or receipt a payment on it.	Initial AJACS security did allow for more system access and functionality than was necessary or appropriate for all court staff. Never, however, was anyone, other than AOC LJ Team, able to do everything in the system. During the Green Valley JP implementation it was determined that another level of security for Court Admin would need to be created. This resricted the deletion of cases, non-systemic events, case documents, etc. to be performed only by members of the Court Admin group. The ability to view and process cases for juveniles did get included in this new security group and the situation was rectified as soon as the issue was made known.
15	Forms in general have many issues such as: a. Incorrect information, typos, insufficient information b. Sentencing forms are very time consuming if more than standard fine imposed, with numerous issues amending charges c. Guilty Plea Proceeding Form not able to populate with range or sentencing and other information that has to be manually entered by clerk d. Probation and Jail Commitment forms and MVD abstract go to Demand Batch Queue instead of Forms in Sentencing e. The Jail Commitment form creates a suspended jail time f. JSO should not be a "fluid" document. Once the document is created it has to be saved as a PDF copy and imported back in the case	a. This was true when implementation for AJMC took place; since then numerous forms have been modified and typos fixed. Some form information pulls from system parameters which are set up for each court. These have also been corrected. Issues regarding insufficient information will need to be explored further to determine what is missing. b. Unclear as to how sentencing forms are more time consuming if more than standard fine imposed. Charge amendment is a fairly simple process. This would be considered a training issue and will require additional information from person reporting the issue. c. This form will be reviewed for possible modification. Court users have information for paragraph 4 in a separate document which is copied/pasted in to this form, as necessary. d. Numerous documents will go to the Demand Batch Queue if they do not need to be brought before the user immediately. This is configurable and can be modified. e. LJ Team will need to further test and validate this issue. Additional information will be required from person reporting this issue. f. JSO is stored within the Case Worksheet (Reports) vs the Documents tab. There is no need to save as PDF to import back in to the case unless user chooses to. There is the ability to modify Case Worksheet/Sentencing information after initial JSO report creation.
16	Warrants do not have law enforcement agency report number (DR#) on them	All warrants will be replaced by one new warrant effective January 1, 2016. This is included in the next release being pushed to production (December 18).
17	MVD Abstract does not merge all the necessary information	Form can be submitted in for revision and adding of additional merge codes

18	Numerous financial issues such as: a. Not able to reconcile and balance end of month funds b. State surcharges not accurately assessed on local fees c. Can only access contract from Contract Search; cannot access contract while in case d. Fees adding twice e. FARE fees readjusted at conversion and with payments (only converted cases.) The system should not be changing the balance because of rounding or recalculation of the FARE fees repeatedly f. 83% Aggregated Surcharge breaks out for an amount different than actually receipted every day; have to report money by accounts daily to finance department; staff have to add the numerous (seen 60) different GL accounts that are all deposited into one of 16 external account numbers	a. All Pima County courts are currently balancing end of month financials. A significant amount of AOC LJ Team support has been necessary to assist with financials and several financials bugs and enhancements have been deployed in R8 and/or will be deployed in R13 (December 18). b. Further information will need to be obtained from person reporting this issue so that further troubleshooting and configuration can be accomplished. c. This is correct. ROA will indicate that a Payment Contract has been created but retrieval of the Payment Contract is only available via the Search function. This may be added as a future enhancement. d. This will need further information and case examples to further troubleshoot and resolve. Possible configuration issue. e. f.
19	Delinquency process not working correctly	Further information is required to troubleshoot and resolve this issue
20	Cases are only going into FARE manually	Unclear as to what the issue is. FARE cases are automatically qualified and determined to be eligible for FARE. They are sent to a FARE Queue where the user has the option to send or not send. This design is by courts request. Once sent to FARE all additonal fees are assessed and events are automatically added to ROA and FARE Events tab in AJACS. This is anything but a manual process.
21	Many issues with converted cases-either need to address a prior sentencing order (incarceration order, probation, ect.) or case without next action. Have years of cases that have restitution liens that are showing in MWQ even though there won't be any more court action.	Converted cases will require additional steps and processing in order to start the AJACS automated processes or in order to close. Based on lessons learned from all the AJACS deployments to date, LJ Team has created documents and procedures dealing specifically with what to do with converted cases. Cases that don't require any further court action but are showing in the Work Queue can simply be selected from the queue and processed. This will remove them from the queue and will be a step required to ensure they are eligible for case closure.

22	Demand Batch Queue (DBQ) issues; forms generated in Demand Batch Queue have to be processed out even if not using; Civil traffic suspensions do not display in DBQ if the case had a prior suspension and therefore not able to monitor cases that are reporting 55 or 58 to MVD. Have had a case with a zero balance get a 55 disposition and didn't know it because it didn't appear in DBQ	A change request/enhancment has been submitted to allow documents in the demand Batch Queue to be deleted, as opposed to being processed. Additional information and case examples will be necessary to further resolve and troubleshoot this issue.